

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the only independent claim.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art discussed in the Background of the Invention in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,281,457 to Chang. The Examiner asserts that the ideas referenced in the Background of the Invention section of the present application disclose a loudspeaker system comprising first and second audio connections and a switch configured to allow selection between a mode that produces sound from only the first audio connection or a mode that produces sound from both first and second audio connections. The Examiner also asserts that the Chang patent discloses a switch that allows selection between two modes of input, and that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the art mentioned in the Background of the Invention section of the present application with the teaching of the Chang patent to include a mechanical slide switch coupled to the switch to select the device to operate in one mode or another mode. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection

Claim 1 recites first and second audio input connections and a switch slide that is positioned so as to prevent connection of an input signal to the second audio input

connection in a first switch position and positioned to permit connection of input signals to ***both the first and second audio signal input connections*** in a second switch position. The Background Section does not disclose a switch slide. The Chang patent teaches that its switch slide prevents both input ports from being used at the same time, instead allowing either input port to be in use but not both simultaneously (*See, inter alia*, col. 1 line 64 to col. 2 line 12; col. 2, lines 54-63; col. 3, lines 7-8). Independent claim 1, on the other hand, recites the switch slide allows access to both of the input connections or one of the input connections, not one or the other. Accordingly, neither the Background Section, nor the Chang patent, alone or in combination, discloses a switch slide with a first position in which connection to the second audio input connection is prevented and a second position that permits connection to both the first and second audio signal input connections, as recited in claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further, the Chang patent is not relevant to loudspeaker applications. The Chang patent relates to a USB port of a computer. A computer is a low power, active system, while a loudspeaker is a high current, passive system. One skilled in the art of loudspeakers, to which the claims specifically refer, would not look to the computer field regarding inputs, because the inputs for the systems are vastly different. Accordingly, the rejection is based on improper hindsight reconstruction. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the alleged admitted prior art in view of Chang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,860 to Hatlen. The Hatlen patent does not address the deficiencies in the proposed combination of the Background Section and the Change patent, as explained

above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2 and 3 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which they depend.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the alleged admitted prior art in view of Chang and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0174855 to Hawkins et al. The Hawkins et al. publication does not address the deficiencies in the proposed combination of the Background Section and the Chang patent, as explained above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the alleged admitted prior art in view of Chang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,330,691 to Gordon. The Gordon patent does not address the deficiencies in the proposed combination of the Background Section and the Chang patent, as explained above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 5 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Albert L. Ferro
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,679

Date: November 30, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
323028_1.DOC